

MEETING SUMMARY

INTERAGENCY ECOLOGICAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING PROGRAM REVIEW 2001

**NOVEMBER 14, 2001
ROMBERG-TIBURON BAY CONFERENCE CENTER
TIBURON, CA**

Present:

SAT members: Heather Peterson, Jan Thompson, Karen Gehrts, Cindy Messer Zach Hymanson, Larry Schemel, Hank Gebhard, Anke Mueller-Solger, Wim Kimmerer, Lee Mecum, Jim Orsi

SAG member: Si Simensted

At large participants: Nick Wilcox, Elizabeth Soderstrom, Erwin Van Nieuwenhuyse, Marc Vayssieres, Tim Smith, Todd Hopkins, Mike Dempsey, Scott Waller

Facilitator: Carolyn Penny

Meeting Summary Prepared by Carolyn Penny

MEETING GOALS

- ❖ Update all review participants on where we are in the 2001 EMP review process and where we are going.
- ❖ Acknowledgement of review participant work.
- ❖ Presentation of some new results about current EMP staff time allocation.
- ❖ Presentation and discussion of customer needs, and plans to improve customer satisfaction.
- ❖ Presentation and discussion of EMP review highlights and the draft plan for monitoring and special studies.

AGENDA

8:30	Refreshments
8:50	Welcome Anke Mueller-Solger (DWR) and Carolyn Penny (Meeting Facilitator)
9:00	EMP News and Review Zachary Hymanson, EMP Program Manager (DWR)
9:25	Discussion
9:45	Coffee Break
10:15	EMP Facelift Anke Mueller-Solger (DWR)
11:00	Discussion
11:45	Meeting Conclusion and Next Steps

12:00 Zachary Hymanson (DWR) and Carolyn Penny (Meeting Facilitator)
Meeting Adjourned

WELCOME

Participants reviewed and agreed to live with the following ground rules:

- (1) Everyone will treat everyone else with respect.
- (2) Each person will strive to be complete and concise so we can stick to the schedule today and overall.
- (3) We will share the floor. No one or two people will dominate the discussion.
- (4) We will stick to the topic under discussion.
- (5) During brainstorming, ideas will be listed without criticism or evaluation.
- (6) Participants will not interrupt each other.
- (7) Participants will engage fully in discussion.
- (8) The facilitator will manage the discussion. As manager of the discussion, the facilitator may intervene to keep the conversation on track and on time.

EMP NEWS AND REVIEW

After a presentation by Zachary Hymanson (see website for presentation materials), participants held a discussion session:

- Create a 2d pie chart – to show budget allocations, include other organizations
- Proportion of USBR funds – find way to represent well
- Regarding meeting customer needs, reliance on USGS monitoring is risky – Not mandatory. Year to year.
- USGS data seems to tell a different chlorophyll story than DFG and DWR data. Sometimes differing measurements and methods are used.
- Table 1 recommendations – pull into text of draft plan and make as specific as possible.

EMP FACELIFT

After a presentation by Anke Mueller-Solger (see website for presentation materials), participants held a discussion session:

- Contaminants:
 - USBR and DWR have indirect link to contaminants.
 - Regional Water Quality Control Board would need to act regarding contaminants. Some sort of user fees would be necessary.

- Advocate with SWRCB or Regional Boards for findings to support someone monitoring for contaminants.
- Monitoring Gaps
 - There's also a need for more monitoring of macrophytes. Go back to EMP needs and mission. Analyze if current monitoring is meeting those needs. If needs not met, have plan to meet or advocate with SWRCB to meet. Another gap-monitoring of larval fish.
 - Microzooplankton – Monitoring gap.
- Include in the report studies that are underway to explore these questions of monitoring.
- Gap analysis – Estuary Report Card
 - Include who is already doing what and where gaps exist
 - Part of the challenge here is identification of appropriate indicators
 - Indicators need not be complex and can be very effective.
- Be explicit in report about present (and past) relationship between Special Studies and Monitoring.
- Lack of continuous data on dissolved oxygen in Central Delta led to recommendation to make station 80 year-round. New benthic station will also help meet this need.
- 2 channel, 1 shoal monitoring stations per basin – That is the goal with the new zooplankton station if there are 3 new stations per basin.
- What is monitoring benefit vs. cost at station C9?
- Suisun Marsh Program – include current stations.
- Analysis needs to justify decisions to drop some stations and use others.
- Sensitive issue – Analysis provides basis for SWRCB to make monitoring mandatory.
- All data reporting needs to be comprehensive and in 1 place. Pull data sets together from different sources to use in modeling. Use models to interpret data, and present model results for public use.
- Why not go to 16 core stations and drop the rest?
 - Remaining stations have other justifications, history for example.
 - There's still a need for phytoplankton/benthos special studies – it would be premature.

- Would be nice if SAT's had a chance to examine the station configuration and comment on whether it will get them what they need.
 - That is part of why we are here.
 - Anke will make presentation available on website, especially station layout.
 - Anke will make sure that slides can be saved and printed.
- What else is missing from draft report?
 - Cost analysis not yet done. Effort analysis done.
 - Special studies funding – separate funding sources sometimes. Show where separate funding sources.
 - Recommend a special study process.

MEETING CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

Zachary Hymanson thanked all participants for their thoughtful engagement and work. He also reminded them of the timeline and continuing opportunities for input using the website.